

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4-13 are in this case. Claim 1 has been rejected under § 102(e). Claims 4, 7 and 9 have been rejected under § 103(a). Claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 have been objected to. Claims 12 and 13 have been allowed. Independent claim 1 has been amended. Claims 5, 6 and 8-11 have been canceled. New independent claims 14-17 have been added.

The claims before the Examiner are directed toward a method of synchronizing (a) neighboring base station(s) of a wireless communication system to a base station of the system that is connected with a mobile unit. The base station that is connected to the mobile unit periodically transmits with higher transmission power than during normal transmission. The neighboring base station(s) receive(s) the higher-power transmission.

§ 102(e) Rejections – Rinne et al. ‘685

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rinne et al., US Patent No. 6,259,685 (henceforth, “Rinne et al. ‘685”). The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed below, claim 1 has been placed in condition for allowance by the inclusion therein of the limitations of claim 5.

§ 103(a) Rejections – Rinne et al. ‘685 in view of Gatherer et al. ‘457

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 7 and 9 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne et al. ‘685 in view of Gatherer et al., US Patent No. 6,396,457. The Examiner’s rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of this claim.

As discussed below, independent claim 1 has been placed in condition for allowance by the inclusion therein of the limitations of claim 5. It follows that claims 4 and 7, that depend from claim 1, also are allowable.

Objections


The Examiner has objected to claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 as being based on a rejected base claim. The Examiner has noted that claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form by amending claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 5. Correspondingly, claim 5 has been canceled.

New claims 14-17 are claims 6, 8, 10 and 11 rewritten in independent form. Correspondingly, claims 6, 8, 10 and 11 and 3 have been canceled.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 12-17 and hence dependent claims 4 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

Date: August 19, 2004